

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 8, 2006, the Examiner noted that claims 1-15 were pending, that claims 4-7, 10-11 and 14-15 have been withdrawn from consideration, and rejected the elected claims 1-3, 8, 9, 12 and 13. Claims 1, 8, 9, 12 and 13 have been amended, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-3, 8, 9, 12 and 13 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

In the Action the Examiner rejected claims 12 and 13 as non-statutory. It is submitted that these claims recite a practical application producing a useful, concrete and tangible result in at least reciting "recording the process information of the specific system in a shared storage medium that is shared by a plurality of systems." Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. section 112 paragraph 2 as indefinite. The Examiner asserted that these claims have elements that are not clearly connected to one another. This rejection is respectfully traversed because the claims recite a clear connection. For example, claim 1 calls for "a generation device **generating process information ...** ; and a recording device for **recording the process information ...** ." which clearly recites a connection. As another example, claim 8 calls for "**generating process information ...** ; and **recording the process information ...** ." It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of the statute. If additional concerns with the claims arise, the Examiner is invited to telephone to resolve the same. Suggestions by the Examiner are also welcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

In the Action on page 8, the Examiner indicated that claims 2 would be allowable if the above-discussed rejection is overcome. It is submitted that claim 2 is allowable. Claim 3 depends from claim 2 and is also submitted to be allowable.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 8, 9, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Nakagaki particularly noting "intervention" systems A-D (fig. 9) and the collected history holding section 17 asserting it as a shared storage medium. The collected history holding section 17 is not a shared storage medium and is not searched by all the systems A-D. Section 17 is not a shared storage but rather a local storage. As shown in figure 9, the history collection section 16 of system A is shown as allowing information flow from system A to system B and B to C and C to D but no flow from D to or toward A. Information can flow from section 16 to section 17 as shown by the arrow pointing from 16 to 17. However,

there is no arrow pointing from 17 to 16. It is clear from figure 9 that intervention systems B-D cannot search the collected history holding section 17 of system A. The collected history holding section 17 of any system cannot be searched by the other systems. Thus, the collected history holding sections 17 are not "a shared storage medium that is shared by a plurality of systems including the specific system and is commonly searched by the plurality of systems" (see claim 1 and similar language in claims 8, 9, 11 and 12). In addition, in confirmation of the non-shared architecture of Nakagaki, a distribution route trace by system A requires that the distribution histories needed to perform a trace must be fetched from systems B-D (see col. 11, line 63 - col. 12, line 21).

It is submitted that the present claimed invention patentably distinguishes over Nakagaki and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 and 112. It is also submitted that claim 2 continues to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 10, 2006

By: /J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501